

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 93 14:08:31 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #807  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 1 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 807

Today's Topics:

1.2 GHz band  
BAYCOM HELP  
Closed Autopatches (2 msgs)  
FCC....How long?  
Field Day: a bummer!  
GPS boards  
Old Hams never die, They just ...  
Phone Lines  
QST  
Radio Amateurs of/du Canada  
Repeater coordination, complaints? (2 msgs)  
Waiting for a License? Don't Call the FCC!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 19:11:32 GMT  
From: news.service.uci.edu!orion.oac.uci.edu!easu348@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 1.2 GHz band  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am thinking of adding the 1.2 GHz module to my Ken. 741, but before I do,  
I want to get some people's opinion of the pros and cons of the band and/or  
the radio wave itself. I've heard people say that even low amounts of emf  
from 1.2 is very bad for you, but on the other hand a few have told me the  
very opposite. Any comments or ideas would be appreciated.

--

Andrew Parker | KD6TGM | easu348@orion.oac.uci.edu

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 18:47:07 GMT  
From: psinntp!gdstech!gdstech!bat@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: BAYCOM HELP  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The interface to L2 from the tnc, and to the terminal program SCC, has never been publicly documented, and I'm sure you will not be able to get it from the authors, as they already seem to feel they have been ripped off.

TFPCX is a TSR used with the GP packet program. GP has a Baycom tnc driver, and a PK232 type driver. It is a very pleasant program also.

--

```
*-----*
*   Pat Masterson   D12-25   | KE2LJ@KC2FD           *
*   Grumman Data Systems | 516-346-6316.          *
*   Bethpage, NY 11746   | bat@gdstech.grumman.com    *
```

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 18:41:18 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Closed Autopatches  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Conway Yee (yee@mipgsun.mipg.upenn.edu) wrote:

: The existance of closed repeaters is legal under 97.85(a) ...

: On the other hand, under 97.117, the use of codes are prohibited. ...

: Now for my first question, are the use of access codes to control the  
: autopatch legal?

I understand your concern. However, if it's illegal, than many many clubs have been operating illegal repeaters for years! I think the distinction is that the AP codes are not kept secret to obscure their MEANING. After all, it is clear what the codes are used for even if you don't know what they are.

: For my second question, are the use of the access codes by those who  
: are not supposed to be privy to them legal?

Probably. That's one reason to keep the codes secret, since there are no legal sanctions against using them without permission. (Absent intentional interference.)

: ... so simply listening to the appropriate frequencies is all  
: that is needed to obtain the codes.

Most repeaters blank touchtones from appearing on the output frequency. A potential jammer would have to listen on the input, which is harder since he may not be in range of the transmitting station.

: My final question concerning closed autopatches is somewhat  
: complicated. Many clubs give access to autopatches only to club  
: members. If the payment of dues is for access to the autopatch, then  
: the closed autopatch is clearly illegal under 97.112(a), "an amateur  
: station shall not be used to transmit or receive messages for hire,  
: nor for communication for material compensation, direct or indirect,  
: paid or promised."

Except you are not paying for use of the STATION (repeater), you are paying for use of the AUTOPATCH. I think this is perfectly legal.

AL N1AL

-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 20:05:12 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Closed Autopatches  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>> Repeaters and autopatches are private property...  
<<

I realize this is opening up old wounds but some things just seem to go the wrong way.

>> If you want to make the rules, then set up your own repeater  
<<

Now where would we be if every licensed ham set up his own repeater pair and claimed it as private spectrum and no one else could use it? surely somewhere there is some middle ground. I can understand complying with the rules set up by someone else. You are using that person's equipment and under the auspices of that person's call. I have no problem with that but saying the equipment is off-limits to other licensed hams even if they are willing to comply with the repeater owner's rules seems to be extreme.

Please, lets not get into calling one another names over this. The subject has been brought up before and gone nowhere. I would have replied to the poster privately except that he did not put his address in the mailnote and I could not decipher the return path in his header.

\_\_mike  
MBeez.HoustonCSSC@Xerox.COM  
N5PWP @ WA4IMZ.#SETX.TX.USA.NA

-----  
Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 18:43:16 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: FCC....How long?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Joe Smulowicz (joes@hpwala.wal.hp.com) wrote:  
: I sent in my license renewal form about a month ago. I realize that one month  
: isn't very long by FCC standards, but I wonder what people's experience has  
: been on this. Since I have no way of confirming that they received my  
: application for renewal I'd like to know how long a wait is typical.

Don't know. But be aware that you can continue to operate past the expiration date of your license as long as you sent in the renewal before the exp date.

AL N1AL

-----  
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1993 03:03:13 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!cunews!revcan!balsam!uuisis!ve3ppe!znha@ames.arpa  
Subject: Field Day: a bummer!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Just got our shiny new club call (ve3wcc) in time for fd event; gave it a good working over to boot.

All-in-all (and what do I know--I worked 12 to 4am shift? %) conditions were as good as I expected them to be, and we did FAR FAR better than we did last year (under ve3aat's call). No complaints there!

#define soapbox  
Our only grouch was florida--we could hear you, excellent signals--darned if you could hear us!  
#undef soapbox

73, Gord.

znha@ve3ppe.isis.org (internet) ve3ppe@ve3osq.#eont.ca.na (packet)

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 93 18:44:04 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: GPS boards  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I was talking with a couple of other hams/techies about putting together some sort of Global Positioning System (GPS) setup to connect to my PC. I got this idea after reading about a setup from Trimble Navigation that uses a small GPS receiver connected to a PCMCIA card and associated software. I thought it would be a interesting project to make something to tell you what your grid square is while doing something like rover in the VHF contests. Sounds like the Trimble Navigation product would be perfect except that I just can't justify the high price! (approx \$1500, I think)

Anyway, one of the guys I was talking to mentioned that Motorola makes a board for about \$200 or so that is a GPS receiver with some sort of digital output of position. This sounds like just the thing for a do-it-yourself project. Does anyone know anything about this Motorola board or anything similar made by another manufacturer?

73,

Scott W01G

=====

Scott Sminkey  
Software Sustaining Engineering  
Xyplex, Inc.  
295 Foster St.  
Littleton, MA 01460  
voice: 508 952-4792  
fax: 508 952-4702  
email: sasminkey@eng.xyplex.com  
(Opinions, comments, etc. are mine, not Xyplex's...)

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 1993 11:46:03 -0700  
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Old Hams never die, They just ...  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David Adams (dadams@cray.com) wrote:  
: Several people have mentioned hearing CW in referigerator motors or

: other static, and suggesting the ghosts of past hams haunting  
: old equipment. I'm wondering if we can fill out the phrase...

: Old Hams never die, They just loose their connection?

: Any better ideas?

: They just loose power?

: go on LONG DXpeditions?

How about:

Old Hams never die, They just rePETER out!

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares  
are destined to plow for those who don't.  
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 16:41:25 GMT

From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!

newsserver.egr.uri.edu!orca!swamik@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Phone Lines

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi

This is not really a hamradio wues, oh well.

Does anyone know what the "specs" are for the 6 wire  
phone coord in homes. The cable running thru our house  
has the following wires:

green  
white w/ green stripe  
blue  
white w/ blue " " "  
orange  
white w/ orange ""

What are each of these for and what are voltage levels etc?

TNX in advance

de KB1AMB (Swami)

swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu

-----  
Date: Thu, 01 Jul 93 14:35:09 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!  
bongo!skyld!jangus@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: QST  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun30.170939.5980@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:

>  
> I received the May and July issues of QST, but no June issue.  
> Is that how it works or did I miss one?

Yup. They're back at League Headquarters right now laughing thier collective posteriors off.

"Bwaha ha ha ha hah....we got his money....har har har, we'll blame it on the US Post office.....More champaigne Ed?"

But seriously folks (for the humor impaired that failed to understand the above) Just call the circulation department and tell them what happened.

Or send e-mail directly to:

"Debra Jahnke, Circulation Manager" <djahnke@arrl.org>

73 es Gm from Jeff

J. Angus: jangus@skyld.tele.com -- "Als ik Kan", Gustav Stickley  
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749-4425 1 (310) 324-6080

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 93 18:32:51 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Radio Amateurs of/du Canada  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm looking for information about joining the Radio Amateurs of/du Canada. (I assume I can do this even though I'm a USA citizen and do not hold a Canadian amateur radio license.) Also, does RAC have regular publications like magazines or newsletters as ARRL does, and if so, can anyone comment on content, quality, etc.

Please email me with any info and I'll summarize to the net.

73,

Scott W01G

=====

Scott Sminkey

Software Sustaining Engineering

Xyplex, Inc.

295 Foster St.

Littleton, MA 01460

voice: 508 952-4792

fax: 508 952-4702

email: sasminkey@eng.xyplex.com

(Opinions, comments, etc. are mine, not Xyplex's...)

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 93 16:52:16 GMT

From: tijc02!eri316@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Repeater coordination, complaints?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 18:43:34 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Repeater coordination, complaints?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jimv@hienergy.East.Sun.COM (Jim Vienneau - Sun Microsystems) writes:

>Yes, the signal is often strong enough that it mixes with the local repeater  
>causing you to not be able to understand the output. Other times (anytime  
>the CT machine is up mostly) it just opens your squelch. Yes, I realize we  
>can force everyone to buy PL. The repeater has a tone on the output  
>already. It still doesn't answer the question of responsible use of the  
>spectrum. If every repeater ran legal limit, no matter if they needed to or  
>not, it would be havoc. Not to mention illegal, you see there's this little  
>"no more than necessary" law that most hams ignore on a regular basis.  
>I'm really surprised by the tone of responses I've received so far. Most  
>seem to be of the "tough, if you din't like it go PL" tone, not what I  
>expected.

Perhaps it is because some of us who have been fighting the spectrum usage wars for years in crowded areas are crying croc tears that your open squelch repeater is having problems with another one 100 miles away.



I have no idea what you mean by "running the legal limit". I can assure you that were the other repeater running the legal limit, you'd have more than just a little trouble 100 miles away.

Central concept to this discussion: Assuming the other repeater is coordinated, it has exactly the same right - no more, no less - as you do to occupy its pair and its users have exactly the same right as do yours to a decent range, useful repeater. You have several options: a) ask as a great favor, if the other repeater owner can help. he has no obligation to so if he does he is doing you a big favor. b) install PL. Ignore the screams of agony from those hams who have to dump \$30 to put PL in a \$500 radio. c) change frequencies. d) change bands.

Item d) is what we did here when we got tired of the interference on 2 meters. It took maybe 6 months to get all our old users over to 70 cm but practically no one complained and we are all MUCH happier.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC	Interested in high performance cars?
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)	Interested in high tech and computers?
Marietta, Ga	Send ur snail-mail address to
jgd@dixie.com	perform@dixie.com for a free sample mag
The Great Tragedy of the 20th century is that Clinton's name isn't on the Wall.	

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 18:38:05 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Waiting for a License? Don't Call the FCC!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C9HxnE.EKD@fc.hp.com>, perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:  
|> I just received the ARRL VE Express Newsletter. Apparently, the FCC is  
|> becoming annoyed at the number of hams that are calling to check on the  
|> status of their license application.  
|>  
|> The FCC's policy is to have licenses applications processed within 90  
|> days. If it hasn't been 13 weeks, DON'T CALL THE FCC! Your call  
|> diverts them from their real task - processing the applications.  
|>  
|> I can sympathize with those that are waiting. I had to wait for my Tech  
|> license several years ago and it seemed to take forever - a whole 8  
|> weeks.  
|>  
|> Perry Scott  
|> AA0ET

--

If we agree not to pester them will they agree to figure out why it takes 7-8 weeks lately? From what our local ARRL VE's said, the FCC has my application in their hot little hands less than a week after I pass. The ARRL actually sends a daily FEDEX packet to the FCC in order to help speed things up. It SHOULD take a decent typist less than 5 minutes to enter all of the data into the computer and it should take the computer a few seconds to verify things (like whether you have a revocation, etc). It should then take a few minutes to print out the certificate, a few seconds for the computer to enter you in the database and then up to 5 days for the license to arrive in the mail. Yes - I know that's an ideal world.

If the process seemingly could take less than two weeks, where are the applications spending the other 6 weeks? Is their backlog or understaffing that bad? Could they perhaps require that the VEC's submit applications electronically? I work with computers enough to realize that the slowdown is not computer related. I wonder how the VEC's could work with the FCC to speed up the process. I do like the recent suggestion of temporary licenses to be assigned by the VE... perhaps that is their response to the problem...

++++++  
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOX?? (in the mail) +  
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +  
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+  
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P  
+

++++++

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 15:42:09 GMT  
From: amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C9G5v4.20p@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1993Jul1.072045.6024@unet.net.com>,  
<C9HHE3.KzK@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>gov  
Subject : Re: Repeater coordination, complaints?

(Jim Reese) writes:

> > There should also be some way for the PL demodulator to be able to  
> > tell the scanner mechanism that the signal on this memory is not one  
> > I am interested in, and it should skip that in the scan unless the  
> > correct PL is present. This is not available in any PL decoder that  
> > I have seen.  
>  
> Both my Standard HT and my Kenwood 741 work this way. The decode in the

> Standard came with the radio no extra charge, the decode board for the  
> Kenwood was \$49. It took all of 5 minutes with a screwdriver to install.  
> Inertia.

The Yaesu FT-5100 and FT-5200 also do this. The scan slows down a bit while the CTCSS decode occurs, but the squelch doesn't open unless the correct tone is present. The optional CTCSS board is required. (I'd never buy a radio without CTCSS decode -- sooner or later the manufacturers will figure this out and start making it a standard option!)

Brian McMinn N5PSS brian.mcminn@amd.com

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 93 17:31:08 GMT  
From: butch!rapnet!news@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun23.194104.19754@VFL.Paramax.COM>,  
<44808.match@sky.civil.utah.edu>, <C9EHtq.Gvs@freenet.carleton.ca>  
Subject : Re: Ground Rods In Concrete

It seems that all of the examples offered have one thing in common:

The object which was struck by lightning was not well grounded.

A ground rod which terminates in a concrete pad is *\*NOT\** a good ground. The resistance between the concrete and the actual earth is too high. A cadwelded frame of rebar (1"+ diameter) with connections extending outside the concrete (into the surrounding earth) for several feet will provide a decent ground, assuming that you have "normal" soil.

Had these objects been well grounded, I suspect that they would have bled off the static potential as corona (or something) and never have developed the potential difference needed to become good lightning targets. Even the tower with the multiple ground rods was set up on insulators, thereby allowing it to develop a significant static charge. It doesn't matter whether it's an up-strike or a down-strike, the electrons still travel.

Many people think that lightning rods are supposed to take lightning hits and shunt them to ground. That's not how they work. Lightning rods bleed off the static charges around the objects that they protect, keeping those objects from becoming good targets for a lightning strike.

73 de wa1vh

--

Lockheed Sanders may disagree so these are solely the opinions of:  
Scott L. Babb - babb@rapnet.sanders.lockheed.com  
"We didn't inherit the Earth from our parents,  
we are borrowing it from our children."

-----  
Date: (null)

From: (null)

Such is the attitude of our coordinating group, SERA, as well.

- Ed WX4S

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 93 18:32:52 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <20sami\$594@dr-pepper.East.Sun.COM>, <20scrhINN8f5@network.ucsd.edu>,  
<20sit7\$5nc@dr-pepper.East.Sun.COM>

Subject : Re: Repeater coordination, complaints?

jimv@hienergy.East.Sun.COM (Jim Vienneau - Sun Microsystems) writes:

>Although I agree that we have no expectation of exclusivity of a frequency,  
>we still need to share the spectrum in a responsible manner. Running legal  
>limit which reaches into areas with other coordinated repeaters, that  
>you have no chance of receiving from, is just irresponsible in my book.  
>We could do the same, run legal limit, put it on a beam pointed south,  
>does that solve the problem? Requiring all the users to buy PL decode  
>boards is not an ideal option either. I guess I don't really expect a  
>resolution to this problem, but where does it end?

I'm sure the coordinators and/or the FCC WOULD have an interest if you  
erected a beam for the purpose of creating interference. Your use  
of the term "responsible" is the classic PC usage, roughly translated means,  
"I want to make you stop doing something I don't like by wrapping myself in  
goodness."

Like it or not, Jim, you're going to have to pull yourself up to at  
least what the rest of the world was doing 20 years ago. And your users  
are going to have to \*GASP\* spend a few bux. I'm sure they can skip a  
couple of meals or something and scrape up the money somehow. And if

they're still listening to the repeater with a long wire and a cat-whisker - well, tough shit. Frankly, complaints about interference between open squelch repeaters fall on completely deaf ears. At least you have a pair. That would be a luxury in some places. Hell, you could even have it worse. Consider our repeater. There is another one barely 100 miles away, fully coordinated, whose link frequency for a remote base is on our INPUT frequency. Did we scream and shout? No. Did we get mad? No. We simply installed PL gated squelch on the repeater and we all now live happily ever after. A rarity in the ham world, no?

For interference on the input, tone gated squelch is the solution that solves interference problems while not excluding non-tone users. When PL is present, the squelch is simply loosened about 20 db to give the receiver maximum sensitivity. Without tone, the signal must be full scale. For interference on the output, the solution is trivial. Put PL on the repeater transmitter. Then any user who doesn't want to hear the other repeater can simply install (or turn on) the PL decoder.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC	Interested in high performance cars?
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)	Interested in high tech and computers?
Marietta, Ga	Send ur snail-mail address to
jgd@dixie.com	perform@dixie.com for a free sample mag
The Great Tragedy of the 20th century is that Clinton's name isn't on the Wall.	

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #807

\*\*\*\*\*